

REMARKS

Claims 3, 5, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 30 stand rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lamming. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The previous remarks of Amendment A are incorporated herein without being repeated. The parts of the office action that address those remarks will be discussed in further traversal of the rejection.

In response to the previous remarks regarding claims 3 and 30, the examiner now points to column 9, lines 10-27 and the confidential print operation of Lamming as corresponding to print format information. The confidential print operation described by Lamming does not discuss any print format information. As an example, claim 30 defines print format as indicating a new page indication. There is no such indication in column 9. Print format information, for example, also includes such things as portrait or landscape orientation. The common ordinary meaning for print format information relates to the layout, font, and other attributes of the look of a printed document as is well known in the art.

The section cited by the examiner merely indicates that there may be a confidential print operation. In that case, a document is only printed when a person is near a particular printer. This is a method of deferring a print job until the user is proximate the printer so that the user may retrieve the document without others seeing it. There is no discussion of the format of the confidentially printed document. Lamming, as has been discussed before, sends document tokens. The document tokens include no indication of print format information. The rejection respecting both claims 3 and 30 should be withdrawn.

Claim 15 concerns a method whereby the wireless device communicates a discovery signal including a request for information about a capability of the another device. In response to the previous remarks, the examiner points to column 6, lines 42-52 of Lamming. In this section, the beeping of a PDA to indicate transmission and receipt of the document is discussed. There is no discussion of capability information. The other portion cited by the examiner is column 19, which doesn't exist in the Lamming reference. If this is intended to be column 9, this is simply the confidential print information which has been discussed above and does not disclose any communication of capability information. Capability information is useful, for example, to allow a wireless device to discover print capabilities of a print by reference capable printer. There is no discussion that any of the printers in Lamming communicate with wireless devices send information about the capability that they have for printing.

Claim 17 concerns receiving a print status message from the another device. The beeping discussed in column 6 of Lamming merely concerns the transmission and/or receipt of a document. The beep, if intended to indicate print status, does not do so. Instead it merely indicates the receipt of transmission. There is no discussion about the status of printing and no information about print status in the beeping. Claim 18 requires the display of the print status information. Lamming's beeping is not a display of print status, and the column 6 portion of Lamming even states that the beep does not permit any ability "to determine what the document is".

There appear to be no new remarks that address the previous arguments regarding claim 21. Claim 21 requires the another device to be a print service adapted to use the reference to obtain print content. This allows, for example, pay print services and independent print services to be realized. Lamming is in a controlled network setting, and the wireless devices access documents stored on the network and use printers employed by the network. There is no discussion of communication with a print service. Also, claim 22 requires that the reference specify a print device to which the print service is adapted to transmit the print content. As has been discussed, the tokens in Lamming are merely document references that can be used as a lookup in a database 14 and there is no disclosure of the token being able to specify a print device to which a particular print service is adapted to transmit the print content.

Claims 2 and 6 stand rejected under § 103 over Lamming in view of Wolff. The rejection is respectfully traversed. There is no suggestion in Lamming or Wolff of the feature in claim 2 where the print by reference specifies billing information. Lamming is in a controlled network environment where a billing operation would not be contemplated. There is no suggestion of access by outsiders to the controlled network, and no discussion of any pay for print service. Lamming's tokens are unequivocally simple database look ups to the local area network database.

An artisan would also not be motivated to look to Wolff to modify Lamming. Wolff is concerned with an enhanced fax machine. Wolff does not concern a wireless device that communicates a reference for printing of any sort.

Instead, Wolff contemplates a system in which a printed document includes machine readable information that may be used by a fax machine to obtain additional information. This is discussed, for example, in column 4 beginning at line 45 and in column 6 beginning at line 4. This does not concern wireless devices. This does not concern the access of wireless devices to printers. Lamming's controlled system is for people having access to controlled networks. The administrators of such networks and the people using them would have absolutely no motivation to have billing or charging information.

No motivation is specified in the evidence. Instead, the examiner finds an unrelated fax usage reference. The examiner concludes that any pay service would be sufficient to meet the claim language. The fax charge service discussed in column 10 of Lamming allows "a charge for using the gateway service." The charge for using the gateway service does not, in any event, indicate that billing information would be included in either the token of Lamming or any of the machine readable indications used in Wolff. Thus, even the combination taken as a whole does not suggest the invention of claim 2. Wolff merely suggests payment for use of a particular service. Wolff does not suggest including billing information in a wirelessly communicated reference to another device.

Regarding claim 6, objections to the combination are noted above as the combination is without evidence to support modification of Lamming by Wolff. With regard to the particular limitation that is relied upon as being taught by Wolff, Wolff does not specify in column 6, lines 58-62, any information whatsoever that relates to a number of copies to be printed. In that portion of

Wolff, the gateway returns a requested page and all or some of a number of pages pointed to by that page. There is no discussion of multiple copies of any page. There is no discussion of any reference that specifies a number of copies of a particular page to be printed. Also, as noted above, there is nothing in Wolff that specifies a format for a wireless reference to be communication to any device. Wolff is limited to machine readable codes embedded in a printed document.

Claim 4 stands rejected under § 103 in view of Lamming '321 and Lamming '665. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Despite the common inventorship of both patents, an artisan would not have been motivated to combine the two Lamming references. The Lamming '321 reference, which is the primary reference in this rejection, concerns printing operations in a controlled network environment. The Lamming '665 reference concerns a database that is used to monitor activities of persons moving in a location that is accessible by wireless means. The dates and times of the locations of people are kept in the database. Examples are provided in Table 2. Lamming '665 has nothing to do with printing network documents. An artisan accordingly wouldn't be motivated to combine the references.

In addition, Lamming does not teach time stamping a token or other reference used for printing. Lamming '665 monitors the locations of people having wireless devices. The locations are time stamped. From this, additional information can be inferred, such as when two persons are located in the same location at the same time. There is no teaching or suggestion of a time stamp associated with the document print request of any form and certainly none to time

stamp a print by reference operation.

Claims 32 and 33 stand rejected under § 103 over Lamming '321 and Nachtshein. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

When added to the other rejection in which unrelated patents are combined, this rejection provides evidence that there is a picking and choosing of features in completely unrelated patents to construct the rejection. This is not a rejection formed upon the evidence as suggested in the collection of patents, but one which begins with the claimed invention that works backwards to pick and choose features from related patents to make a rejection. Applicants submit that again there is no motivation to combine the applicable two references here.

Nachtshein concerns a system for use by airlines whereby Bluetooth could be used to detect devices that should have been turned off and that could interfere with airline communications. It has nothing to do with printing. It has nothing to do with controlled network environments like that in Lamming. It seems that the reference might have been selected based upon the sole fact that it uses Bluetooth. There is not evidence to support the combination, and the combination actually suggests that there is a hindsight reconstruction of the invention as claimed.

Also, the combination does not meet the claim limitations. In the claims, a Bluetooth communication protocol includes a reference used to retrieve print content from the Internet. In claim 32, the communication signal is sent to a print device. In claim 33, the communication signal is sent to a print service. The Nachtshein reference identifies Bluetooth capable devices that are powered on an


airplane and allows the staff of an airplane to tell the users to turn the devices off. What this has to do with print operations on a controlled network is not at all clear. An artisan would not seek to use the wireless detection method of Nachtshein to modify the print operations in Lamming.

For all of the above reasons, applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the application. Should the examiner believe that a telephone interview would expedite prosecution, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Steven P. Fallon
Registration No. 35,132

April 5, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive - Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315
Customer Number 24978

P:\DOCS\3417\65543\881345.DOC